DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 146 JC 900 503

AUTHOR Betts, Lee John
TITLE Survey on Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations: A Preliminary Summary/Analysis of Responses.
INSTITUTION Frederick Community Coll., Md.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; College Presidents; *Community Colleges; Group Membership; Leaders; *National Organizations; National Surveys; *Organizational Effectiveness; Participant Satisfaction; *Professional Associations; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Community and Junior Colls

ABSTRACT

In 1990, a survey was conducted of selected professional staff at 139 community, junior, and technical colleges nationwide to determine which national leadership/service organizations (NL/SO's) the colleges were affiliated with, to identify the NL/SO programs and services utilized by the colleges, and to evaluate those services. The survey was sent to presidents of 62 randomly selected colleges and 77 community college professionals who had served in leadership roles in various NL/SO's or had been recognized by one or more of these organizations as leaders with national stature. Major findings of the study, based on responses from 52% of the presidents and 48% of the other professionals, were as follows: (1) on the average, colleges were affiliated with nine different NL/SO's; (2) 80% of the respondents rated the overall value of their institution's involvement in all NL/SO's to be significant or very significant; (3) five organizations or groups of organizations were mentioned by 54% of the respondents as having provided significant leadership or service to their colleges; (4) the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) was identified by all respondents as having provided significant leadership, with 96% rating it one of the four most significant or valuable NL/SO's; and (5) 65% of the respondents indicated that their institution's involvement in their four top ranked NL/SO's was greater in 1990 than it had been in 1980. The survey instrument and survey response tables are attached.

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325146

SURVEY ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP/SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

A Preliminary Summary/Analysis Of Responses

October, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. J. Betts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Lee John Betts
President
Frederick Community College
Frederick, MD 21702

JC 900503

Frederick Community College

7932 Opossumtown Pike • Frederick, MD 21701 • 301/694-5240 • Fax 301/694-1298

October 10, 1990

TO: Selected Community College Colleagues

FROM: Lee John Betts

RE: Survey on Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations

During this summer I developed and distributed a survey instrument described in the enclosed draft document to elicit information about national leadership/service organizations (NL/SOs) with whom community, junior and technical colleges affiliate. I am referring to organizations such as AACJC, NISOD, CASE and ACCT.

Enclosed are a draft summary and an analysis of responses from the 79 respondents. I share it with you and a few other colleges for information and reaction.

Personally, I was surprised by the extensive numbers of NL/SOs with which our colleges have affiliated and the positive value colleges have attributed to these affiliations. The survey was designed to obtain information regarding these organizations; not to critique them. A copy of the survey questionnaire is appended.

I am contemplating the following subsequent actions:

1. Compare responses from the two different groups surveyed and summarize the open ended responses to certain questions.
2. Disseminate more specific information to many of the indicated organizations regarding respondents' comments.
3. Publish an article or two in a neutral publication.
4. Obtain descriptive information from many of these NL/SOs through a different survey.
5. Write a small monograph compiling information in greater detail from this survey and the survey to be distributed to the NL/SOs.

I believe this study will provide a baseline of information on these organizations which will increase our knowledge of their impact on our colleges and provide a basis for further research and study. Increasingly, I am convinced that these national leadership/service organizations are providing our movement with much of the direction, vitality and vision which have made it one of the major constructive and renewing forces in our society.

I look forward to hearing from you.

LJB:whw:surconcl:9/90

Survey on Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations

A Preliminary Summary/Analysis of Responses

Community, junior and technical colleges receive guidance, stimulus, leadership and technical assistance from a variety of external organizations. As community-based colleges they are influenced significantly by local and state organizations and agencies. In addition, numerous national and regional organizations have emerged to provide leadership, technical assistance and services to these institutions. This study focuses on these national leadership/service organizations serving community colleges, which shall be referred to frequently in this report as NL/SOs. The following pages present a brief description of the study, summary of responses, major findings and initial conclusions. A more complete analysis is planned.

The primary purpose of this study was to gather information about national leadership/service organizations: their identity, their perceived value and the extent of institutional affiliation and utilization of their services.

Methodology

During the summer of 1990 a survey (see Appendix A) was designed and distributed to selected professional staff at 139 community, junior and technical colleges in the United States. The key questions this survey endeavored to address were:

- With which national leadership/service organizations have community, junior and technical colleges affiliated?
- How have these colleges utilized NL/SO programs and services?
- How do these professionals evaluate the value of these NL/SOs and their services to their institutions?

The survey was sent to two different groups of community, junior and technical college professionals. The first group consisted of presidents at 62 randomly selected community, junior and technical colleges; 32 presidents (52%) from 24 states responded. The average enrollment at responding institutions was 4,600 students. It was assumed that college presidents were in the best position to gather appropriate data and address the survey questions.

The second group selected for the survey consisted of 77 community college professionals who had served in leadership roles in various NL/SOs or who had been recognized by one or more of these organizations as leaders with national stature. Among those "leaders" invited to respond to the survey were recent past chairs/presidents of the following organizations: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), COMBASE, Commission on Independent Colleges (CIC), Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges (CS/RCC), American Association

of Women in Community and Junior Colleges (AAWCJC), National Community College Hispanic Council (NCCHIC), National Council on Black American Affairs (NCBAA), and the Presidents Academy. Also invited to respond were the 1989 chairs of all AACJC councils, consortia, and commissions, randomly selected presidents of member institutions of the League for Innovation in the Community College and "blue chip" presidents listed in a recent study by Roueche, Baker and Rose.[1] Thirty-seven "leaders" (48%) responded to the questionnaire, including 22 presidents (60%), eight trustees (21%), and seven college administrators (19%) who were not CEOs. The average enrollment at these responding institutions was 11,000. It was assumed that those who served in leadership positions in national leadership/service organizations might have different experiences and perspectives than a random sampling of college presidents.

Only persons directly affiliated with community, junior or technical colleges were surveyed, because the survey was designed to obtain consumer responses. As with any survey, not all respondents answered all questions. However, information from all returned surveys which contained responses to the first question were included in the following summary analysis.

Brief Summary of Responses

An average respondent indicated that his/her institution was affiliated with approximately nine different national leadership/service organizations (not including AACJC councils, consortia or commissions). Respondents indicated that their colleges participated in an average of 3.8 activities sponsored by each of their colleges four top-ranked NL/SOs. The majority of respondents (80%) considered the overall value of their institution's involvement in all NL/SOs to be significant or very significant. All respondents indicated their colleges were affiliated with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). Overall, respondents felt that a great number and variety of the NL/SOs were providing effective national leadership and valuable services to their institutions.

Major Findings

The preliminary analysis produced four major sets of findings which are related to the survey questions.

1. The first set of findings are related to research question one which asked respondents to list and rank all NL/SOs providing significant leadership or valuable service to their colleges.

    - Perhaps the most significant finding was that community, junior and technical colleges were affiliated with a very diverse and extensive number of national leadership/service organizations providing valuable assistance and services. Respondents listed an average of nine different NL/SOs with which their colleges had affiliated. No college listed less than three

[1] Roueche, John E., George A. Baker, III, Robert R. Rose, Shared Vision: Transformational Leadership in American Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1989.

NL/SOs; several colleges listed 15. Over 48 different NL/SOs provided assistance to at least two of the 69 different colleges responding to this national survey. Nine different organizations were affiliated with at least 27 colleges (40% of those responding).

- Five organizations or groupings of organizations were mentioned by more than half (54%) of the responding colleges as having provided significant leadership or service to their colleges. The organizations were the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), the regional accrediting associations, the League for Innovation in the Community College and the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) in combination with the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas. Sixty-six respondents (96% of total) listed one of these five organizations as the most significant/valuable leadership service organization for their colleges.

- The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) is one of the major NL/SOs to which most community, junior and technical colleges turn for national leadership and service. All 69 colleges identified AACJC as one of the organizations which have provided significant leadership to the community college movement and valuable services to respondents' colleges. Forty-four of the colleges (64%) indicated that AACJC provided the most significant leadership/service to their colleges. A total of 66 respondents (96%) rated AACJC as one of the four most significant or valuable national leadership/service organizations for their colleges.

- Many NL/SOs had a much broader educational clientele than community, junior or technical colleges. Among the most frequently mentioned NL/SOs serving a broader clientele were the regional accrediting associations, American Council on Education (ACE), Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), American College Testing Program (ACT), National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), and the American Vocational Association (AVA). Nevertheless, when asked to identify the NL/SO providing the most significant leadership/service to their colleges, only one respondent indicated an organization that served a broader clientele. All other respondents indicated an organization whose primary or exclusive focus was toward community, junior or technical colleges.

- Frequency of listing by respondents did not necessarily indicate the value of an organization to an individual college. For instance, although the National Association of Independent Junior Colleges and the American Indian Higher Education Consortium were listed only by four and two respondents respectively, each was listed by at least one college as their most significant/valuable NL/SO. As might be expected, the unique characteristics of certain colleges led them to affiliate with certain types of organizations. For example, colleges with a strong technical focus often affiliated with organizations similar to the American Vocational Association, while independent colleges generally affiliated with organizations serving the interests of independent colleges.

2. The second set of findings related to survey questions two, three and four, which asked respondents questions about those organizations they had ranked in question one as their top four NL/SOs in providing significant national leadership and services to their institutions during recent years. Respondents were asked: 1) What was the extent of their institution's participation in these NL/SOs? 2) How did they perceive the value of various organizational characteristics? 3) How had institutional involvement changed during the last decade?

   - Extent of Institutional Participation. Respondents generally indicated that their colleges participated in a wide range of activities and services sponsored by their top-ranked national leadership/service organizations ranging from annual conferences to publications and research activities. In general, the higher an organization was ranked by a respondent, the more extensively the activities and services of that organization were utilized by the respondent's colleges.

   - Perceived Value of Top Ranked Organizations. Generally, respondents rated the value to their colleges of various organizational characteristics (such as vision and vitality) of their four top ranked NL/SOs as high or very high.

   - Change in Institutional Involvement. Most respondents (65%), indicated that their institution's involvement in their four top ranked NL/SOs was greater in 1990 than it had been in 1980. Furthermore, a significant number of respondents (30%) indicated that their institution's involvement was much greater in 1990 than in 1980, especially with their top ranked NL/SO. In contrast, only one percent of respondents indicated that their institutions involvement was less in 1990 than it had been in 1980.

3. The third finding is related to question six which addressed individual college affiliation with AACJC councils, consortia or commissions. Almost all respondents indicated that their colleges were affiliated with several AACJC councils. Most frequently mentioned councils were the American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges (AAWCJC) and the National Council for Resource Development (NCRD). However, the majority of AACJC councils were listed numerous times by respondents. Respondents who indicated AACJC council affiliation listed an average of six and one-half councils/consortia/commissions with which their colleges were affiliated.

4. The fourth finding is related to question five which asked respondents to rate the overall value to their institutions of all national leadership/service organizations with which their colleges affiliated.

Table 1

As indicated in Table 1, over four-fifths (80%) of all respondents rated the overall value of all NL/SOs to their college as significant or very significant. Coincidentally, the percentage for both the random sampling of presidents and selected "leaders" groups was exactly the same.

Preliminary Conclusions and Some Questions

It is appropriate for a movement as diverse and dynamic as the community, junior and technical college movement whose participating colleges have many common interests, yet many varied interests, to be assisted by a large number of national leadership/service organizations (NL/SOs). Not only are the mix of colleges in the movement diverse and complex, but most comprehensive community colleges are diverse and complex within themselves. Different professionals within one college have radically different responsibilities, training and perspectives and probably benefit from affiliation with a wide variety of different leadership/service organizations.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges recognized this diversity twenty years ago when it began to establish its council/consortia structure. Other organizations, such as the Association of Community College Trustees, have also emerged to lead and serve constituencies that had been inadequately served in the past. It is part of the genius and vitality of the movement to recognize unmet existing needs and future opportunities, whether local or national, and to respond in a specific, organized and effective manner. It is also in keeping with our free market economy.

Almost without exception the survey responses indicated that there is a great deal of satisfaction with the leadership and services provided by the NL/SOs with which their colleges were affiliated. It may be concluded that these organizations form a valuable support system for the nation's community, junior and technical college movement, providing leadership, energy, information, services and networking opportunities. No one organization can provide this segment of post-secondary education with all that it needs in national leadership and program services. Rather, dozens of different NL/SOs provide unique services and valuable assistance to the great variety of institutions in the community, junior and technical college movement.

However, as the number of NL/SOs continues to grow, questions will inevitably arise. How many are enough, or too many? How does the president of a community college decide with which organizations to affiliate? Does anyone in the "movement" have a clear understanding of all these organizations and the services they provide? Has the multiplicity of organizations resulted in excessive duplication of programming or effort? If so, is this duplication bad or good?

There are strong indications that our nation may be entering a recession and that travel costs will escalate significantly. Several states are already encountering serious deficits and mandating reductions in college budgets. What will be the implications of restricted budgets on institutional memberships and participation in NL/SOs, especially those with substantial membership fees?

We probably will not agree with one another on the answers to these questions but, in time, most college presidents (and boards) will be forced to address these issues.

Collaboration

In recent years we have seen a trend toward cooperation and coordination among several of the more prominent NL/SOs. NISOD and the League for Innovation have coordinated several recent joint ventures. AACJC and ACCT have blended together their federal relations programs. Nevertheless, the degree of coordinated planning and activities among most NL/SOs is informal and infrequent.

A Modest Proposal

Perhaps it is time for the evolution of a community college "common market." As post-secondary education associations have established a framework for coordinated action under the "umbrella" of the American Council on Education, is it time for those national leadership/service organizations whose primary constituencies are community, junior and technical colleges to form a stronger, more formal alliance to coordinate planning and scheduling, minimize duplicative efforts and reinforce common goals and programs for the movement? If the considerable talents, energies, influence and leadership of each organization where coordinated to accomplish a few major national goals, could not the full potential of the movement be more rapidly achieved?

To establish a community college "common market" would not be easy. The NL/SOs differ in focus and structure. A few have professional staffs, permanent CEOs and varied, comprehensive programs and activities. Others have no full-time staff and frequently change elected leadership. Many NL/SOs are single purpose organizations. Nevertheless, there may be merit in establishing more formal liaisons among these organizations so that our national image and agenda become clearer and our considerable achievements and innovative leadership more readily apparent.

Already the "movement" is seen as a pacesetter in achieving many contemporary educational goals. Providing access and opportunity to minorities, older adults, displaced workers and homemakers; responding flexibly to business and industry needs for state-of-the-art training and retraining; pioneering in academic assessment, developmental education and literacy training... these are a few of the movement's leadership hallmarks. With greater coordination at the national level it may attain a national leadership role far beyond present achievements, a leadership role which will bring new visibility, respect and support throughout American society.

A Problem of Definition

A major issue is this survey's design related to the identification of national leadership/service organizations. I was unable to obtain any current compendium of these organizations or any consensus in discussion with professional colleagues on which organizations should be included and which excluded. Should the study include only organizations having a nationwide membership or affiliation? How would we define nationwide? Would the study exclude the North Central Association with member colleges in approximately 20 states stretching from Arizona to West Virginia because it is a "regional" association? If so, should the study also exclude the League for Innovation in the Community College whose primary membership was located in fewer states than NCA's membership?

A decision was made to side step the issue and let each respondent identify those institutions he or she believed were NL/SOs. It was assumed that this procedure would result in the broadest possible identification of these organizations. To stimulate thinking, an extensive list of possible organizations was provided with the surveys when mailed.

In the survey results 37 respondents (54%) listed regional accrediting associations among their list of national leadership/service organizations while 28 respondents (41%) listed various state associations. Perhaps many respondents defined NL/SOs as organizations relating to national issues regardless of the geographical extensiveness of their membership or clientele. Others may have chosen to include state and regional organizations which provided leadership and services similar to or as valuable as NL/SOs with a more extensive national membership base.

Lee John Betts
President
Frederick Community College
Frederick, MD 21702
(301) 694-1229

LJB:whw
surconcl:9/90

A Survey Questionnaire
Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations
sponsored by
Frederick Community College, Frederick, MD 21702

It is requested that this survey questionnaire be completed by the person to whom it has been addressed. Completing this survey questionnaire should take approximately 25 minutes when all the data is available.

Please respond from a **user's perspective**. The key questions this survey endeavors to address are:

- With which national leadership/service organizations has your institution affiliated?
- How has your institution utilized their programs and services?
- How would you evaluate their value to your institution?

The development of this survey questionnaire has benefitted from the advice of the following professionals:

- Don Doucette, League for Innovation in the Community College
- Terry O'Banion, League for Innovation in the Community College
- Connie Odems, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
- John Roueche, Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas
- Suanne Roueche, National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development
- David Viar, Association of Community CollegeTrustees
- Matthew Kelly, Frederick Community College
- Jon Larson, Frederick Community College
- Richard Yankosky, Frederick Community College

Many thanks for your cooperation!

Please complete by **August 10, 1990**
and return to:

Lee John Betts, President
Frederick Community College
7932 Opossumtown Pike
Frederick , MD 21702

NOTE: A stamped return-addressed envelope has been enclosed.

Survey on Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations

Directions: Please respond to each survey item from the perspective of your institution's involvement with national leadership/service organizations and your perceived value of this involvement.

1. Significant Leadership and Program Services. List below those national organizations which have provided significant leadership to the community college movement and valuable programs and services to your college or institution during recent years. (Please review the list of national leadership organizations on page two. You are not restricted to these organizations.)

   NOTE: Several national leadership/service organizations have satellite organizations offering significant programs and services, such as the AACJC Councils. An opportunity is provided in item 7, page 7, for you to indicate your institution's involvement in AACJC Councils, Consortia and Commissions.

- In the column to the right below, rank order the organizations you list by the significance of their leadership/service to your college. (1=most significant leadership.)

Name of Organization	Rank Order Significance
A.	
B.	
C.	
D.	
E.	
F.	
G.	
H.	
I.	
J.	

- Now, circle the letter (A., B., C., etc.) in question 1 above, preceding any organization(s) you have listed above with which your institution had no known involvement 10 years ago.

- If there are additional national leadership/service organizations with which your institution has been involved recently, please list them on the back of this page.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (if any)

Community College National Leadership/Service Organizations
(A Sampling)

The following is a listing of some national leadership/service organizations providing services to community, technical and junior colleges. For questions one through four you may select from this listing, but you are not restricted to these organizations. Abbreviations in parentheses may be used to identify organizations in questions that follow. You may wish to use this page as a worksheet for developing your list for survey item number one (1).

- o American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC)
- o AACJC Councils/Consortia (see listing under item 6)
- o Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT)
- o American Council on Education (ACE)
- o American Vocational Association (AVA)
- o American College Testing Program (ACT)
- o Council for the Advancement and Support for Education (CASE)
- o College Board (CEEB)
- o COMBASE
- o Community Colleges for International Development (CCID)
- o Community College Leadership Programs *
  - o U.C. Berkley (CCLP-UC/B)
  - o U. Florida (CCLP-UFL)
  - o Florida State (CCLP-FSU)
  - o U. Michigan (CCLP-UM)
  - o U. Texas (CCLP-UT)
  - o Virginia Tech (CCLP-VPI)
- o ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges (ERIC/UCLA)
- o Education Commission of the States (ECS)
- o Harvard Management Institutes (Harvard)
- o International/Intercultural Consortium (I/IC)
- o Instructional Telecommunications Consortium (ITC)
- o League for Innovation in the Community College (League)
- o National Coalition of Advanced Technologies (ATC)
- o National Effective Transfer Consortium (NETC)
- o National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development at U. of Texas (NISOD)
- o Phi Theta Kappa (PTK)
- o The President's Academy (Academy)

Consider also:

- o Regional Accrediting Organizations
- o National Centers for Higher Education
- o Other ERIC Centers
- o State Associations of Community Colleges
- o Area specific organizations such as
- o AACRAO, APPA, AIR, CUPA, NACUBO, NASPA

Other NL/SO's with which your institution is affiliated:

- o _____
- o _____
- o _____
- o _____

*This list is illustrative. Many other strong CCLP programs serve our colleges. If you wish to identify another university program, write: CCLP - (name of univ.)

Note: The next three (3) questions should be answered for each of your top four ranked organizations only.

2. Institutional Participation. How has your institution participated in the four top ranked organizations you listed in question one (1)? Check all those activities and services in which your college has participated in recent years which were sponsored by your four top ranked national leadership organizations.

Organizations	(top ranked)	(second ranked)	(third ranked)	(fourth ranked)
Insert organization name or abbreviation* from question 1.				
Activities/Services				
A. Annual Conf./ Conventions				
B. Regional/Special Meetings/Wksp.				
C. Publications				
D. Telecommunications activities				
E. Research Activities				
F. Federal Relations Services/ Programs				
G. Graduate/Other Training				
Other Programs/Services (please specify)				
H.				
I.				
J.				
K.				

* For instance, if one of your top ranked organizations is the American Council on Education, you may write: ACE.

3. Perceived Value of Organization. Based on your institution's recent involvement with your four top ranked organizations indicate your assessment of the various organizational characteristics listed below by circling the most appropriate number to the right of each organizational characteristic.

Organization 1 (top ranked)

write organization name or abbreviation above

Organizational Characteristics	circle appropriate number below					
	very high	high	moderate	low	very low	not applicable
A. Vision and vitality	5	4	3	2	1	0
B. National profile & influence	5	4	3	2	1	0
C. Scope/extent of programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
D. Value of conferences/workshops	5	4	3	2	1	0
E. Value of publications	5	4	3	2	1	0
F. Value of other programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
G. Overall value of organization to your institution	5	4	3	2	1	0

Organization 2 (second ranked)

write organization name or abbreviation above

Organizational Characteristics	circle appropriate number below					
	very high	high	moderate	low	very low	not applicable
A. Vision and vitality	5	4	3	2	1	0
B. National profile & influence	5	4	3	2	1	0
C. Scope/extent of programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
D. Value of conferences/workshops	5	4	3	2	1	0
E. Value of publications	5	4	3	2	1	0
F. Value of other programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
G. Overall value of organization to your institution	5	4	3	2	1	0

Organization 3 (third ranked) _____

write organization name or abbreviation above

Organizational Characteristics	circle appropriate number below					
	very high	high	moderate	low	very low	not applicable
A. Vision and vitality	5	4	3	2	1	0
B. National profile & influence	5	4	3	2	1	0
C. Scope/extent of programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
D. Value of conferences/workshops	5	4	3	2	1	0
E. Value of publications	5	4	3	2	1	0
F. Value of other programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
G. Overall value of organization to your institution	5	4	3	2	1	0

Organization 4 (fourth ranked) _____

write organization name or abbreviation above

Organizational Characteristics	circle appropriate number below					
	very high	high	moderate	low	very low	not applicable
A. Vision and vitality	5	4	3	2	1	0
B. National profile & influence	5	4	3	2	1	0
C. Scope/extent of programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
D. Value of conferences/workshops	5	4	3	2	1	0
E. Value of publications	5	4	3	2	1	0
F. Value of other programs/services	5	4	3	2	1	0
G. Overall Value of Organization to Your Institution	5	4	3	2	1	0

4. Change in Institutional Involvement. Indicate the level of your institution's participation in your four top ranked national leadership/service organizations in 1990 compared with 1980.

	much greater in 1990	greater in 1990	about same	less in 1990	much less in 1990
o ORGANIZATION 1 (top ranked). Name: _____	5	4	3	2	1
o ORGANIZATION 2 (2nd ranked). Name: _____	5	4	3	2	1
o ORGANIZATION 3 (3rd ranked). Name: _____	5	4	3	2	1
o ORGANIZATION 4 (4th ranked). Name: _____	5	4	3	2	1

5. Overall Value. In general, how would you rate the value to your institution of all national leadership/service organizations with which your institution has affiliated? (circle one)

very significant value	significant value	moderate value	occasional value	little value	no value
5	4	3	2	1	0

6. Affiliation with Defunct Organizations. During the seventies there were several national leadership/service organizations (such as the ACCTion Consortium and GT-70) which are no longer in existence. List below any of these defunct organizations with which your college was affiliated.

o _____ o _____

o _____ o _____

7. AACJC Council Involvement. All AACJC Councils and Consortia are listed below. Circle the letters to the left of all councils with which your institution has had active affiliation in recent years.

A. American Association of Women in Community & Junior Colleges (AAWCJC)

B. Community College Humanities Association (CCHA)

C. Council of Two-Year Colleges of Four-Year Institutions (CTCFI)

D. National Community College Hispanic Council (NCCHC)

E. National Council on Black American Affairs (NCBAA)

F. National Council of Community College Business Officials (NCCCBO)

G. National Council for Marketing & Public Relations (NCMPR)

H. National Council on Community Services & Continuing Education (NCCSCE)

I. National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA)

J. National Council for Occupational Education (NCOE)

K. National Council for Research & Planning (NCRP)

L. National Council for Resource Development (NCRD)

M. National Council for Staff, Program & Organizational Development (NCSPOD)

N. National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC)

O. National Council on Student Development (NCSD)

P. Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC)

Q. International Intercultural Consortium (IIC)

R. Instructional Telecommunications Consortium (ITC)

S. Consortium on Advanced Technology Centers (ATC)

T. Commission on Independent Colleges (CIC)

U. Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges (CS/RCC)

V. Commission on Urban Community Colleges (CUCC)

W. Joint Commission on Federal Relations (JCFR)

8. Issues Needing Attention. With reference to community, junior or technical colleges,

   A. What major policy issues at the national level are not being adequately addressed or need greater emphasis or leadership?

      1. _____

      2. _____

      3. _____

      4. _____

   B. What major policy issues at the international level are not being adequately addressed or need greater emphasis or leadership?

      1. _____

      2. _____

      3. _____

      4. _____

9. Personal Role in National Organizations. List below those community college national leadership/service organizations with which you have had personal affiliation and any office or position you may have had with those organizations.

Organizations	Position/Office
A. _____	_____
B. _____	_____
C. _____	_____
D. _____	_____
E. _____	_____
F. _____	_____
G. _____	_____

Please indicate the state in which your institution is located: _____

If you desire to receive a summary copy of this study, and wish to be listed in a future publication as a contributor, sign below and provide the requested information.

Signature: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

College: _____

Address: _____

_____ Phone: ( ) _____

Thank you for the time you have invested in responding to this survey. Please return your completed survey document in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope as soon as possible.

Please complete by August 10, 1990
and return to:
Lee John Betts, President
Frederick Community College
7932 Opossumtown Pike
Frederick, MD 21702

LJB:whw
study90

Table 1

Overall Value of NL/SOs

Value to College	Number	Percentage
Very significant value	17	26
Significant value	34	54
Moderate value	11	18
Occasional value	2	2
Little/no value	0	0
Totals	**64**	**100**

Table 2

Total Responses to Question One

Total Responses: 69
Numbers in parentheses indicate (leaders/random sample) responses

	Organizations	Total		Highest Significance		High Significance	
1)	American Association of Community & Junior Colleges (AACJC)	69	(37/32)	44	(22/22)	22	(15/7)
(x)	NISOD & CCLP-Univ. Texas combined	52	(25/27)	10	(4/6)	26	(16/10)
2)	Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT)	47	(24/23)	3	(2/1)	27	(15/12)
3)	Regional accrediting associations	37	(16/21)	4	(1/3)	22	(10/12)
3)	League for Innovation in the Community College (League)	37	(25/12)	5	(5/0)	12	(4/8)
5)	National Institute for Staff & Organizational Development at Univ. of Texas (NISOD)	32	(14/18)	6	(3/3)	17	(10/7)
6)	State associations relating to community colleges	28	(14/14)	6	(2/4)	11	(4/7)
6)	The Presidents Academy (Academy)	28	(12/16)	0	(0/0)	11	(5/6)
6)	American Council on Education (ACE)	28	(15/13)	0	(0/0)	10	(4/6)
9)	Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE)	27	(16/11)	0	(0/0)	9	(5/4)
10)	American College Testing Program (ACT)	20	(12/8)	1	(0/1)	4	(2/2)
10)	Community College Leadership Programs-Univ. of Texas (CCLP)	20	(11/9)	4	(1/3)	10	(7/3)
12)	Phi Theta Kappa (PTK)	16	(12/4)	0	(0/0)	4	(4/0)
13)	ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges (ERIC-UCLA)	15	(7/8)	0	(0/0)	2	(1/1)
14)	National Assoc. College & Univ. Business Officers (NACUBO)	14	(9/5)	0	(0/0)	4	(2/2)
15)	American Vocational Association (AVA)	12	(7/5)	0	(0/0)	2	(1/1)

Other Organizations Mentioned by Four or More Respondents

National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) (9), COMBASE (8), CCLP-University of Michigan/Community College Consortium (7), AACJC Councils (7), The College Board (7), Harvard Management Seminars (7), Association for Institutional Research (AIR) (5), American Association of Women in Community & Junior Colleges (AAWCJC) (4), Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) (4), College and University Personnel Assoc. (CUPA) (4), National Effective Transfer Consortium (NETC) (4), National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Devlopment (NCSPOD) (4), National Council of Independent Junior Colleges (4).

Other Organizations Mentioned by Two or Three Respondents

American Assoc. for Higher Education (AAHE), Association of Governing Boards (AGB), American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Aspen Institute, Association of Independent Colleges, Community College Satellite Network, Education Commission of the States, International Intercultural Consortium (I/IC), National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges, National Assoc. of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), National Assoc. of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), Student Success Consortium and the following Community College Leadership Programs: University of Arkansas, University of Florida, Florida State University, North Carolina Sate University, Teachers College/Columbia University, University of Iowa.

Table 3
AACJC Councils/Consortia Involvement

Councils/Consortia/Commissions		Colleges Indicating Affiliation	
A.	American Association of Women in Community & Junior Colleges (AAWCJC)	36	(20/16)
B.	Community College Humanities Association (CCHA)	19	(10/9)
C.	Council of Two-Year Colleges of Four-Year Institutions (CTCFI)	2	(2/0)
D.	National Community College Hispanic Council (NCCHC)	7	(7/0)
E.	National Council on Black American Affairs (NCBAA)	21	(14/7)
F.	National Council of Community College Business Officers (NCCCBO)	22	(15/7)
G.	National Council for Marketing & Public Relations (NCMPR)	19	(12/7)
H.	National Council on Community Services & Continuing Education (NCCSCE)	23	(15/8)
I.	National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA)	19	(11/8)
J.	National Council for Occupational Education (NCOE)	20	(12/8)
K.	National Council for Research & Planning (NCRP)	13	(9/4)
L.	National Council for Resource Development (NCRD)	34	(16/18)
M.	National Council for Staff, Program & Organizational Development (NCSPOD)	23	(13/10)
N.	National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC)	2	(2/0)
O.	National Council on Student Devlopment (NCSD)	15	(11/4)
P.	Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC)	3	(3/0)
Q.	International Intercultural Consortium (IIC)	15	(10/5)
R.	Instructional Telecommunications Consortium (ITC)	16	(11/5)
S.	Consortium on Advanced Technology Centers (ATC)	5	(5/0)
T.	Commission on Independent Colleges (CIC)	3	(3/0)
U.	Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges (CS/RCC)	10	(2/8)
V.	Commission on Urban Community Colleges (CUCC)	7	(5/2)
W.	Joint Commission on Federal Relations (JCFR)	14	(7/7)
	TOTAL	348	(215/133)

LJB:whw:surresp:9/90

Table 4

Survey of National Leadership/Service Organizations (NL/SOs) Preliminary Comparisons: Random/Leader Responses

Data Descriptions	Randomly Selected Presidents	Selected College Leaders	Totals
• Number of responses			
• Comprehensive colleges	28	30	58
• Technical colleges	3	4	7
• Independent colleges	1	3	4
• All colleges	32	37	69
• Average college enrollment	4,600	11,000	8,000
• College enrollment ≥2,500	15	9	34
• College enrollment ≤10,000	2	18	20
• Number of states respresented	24	22	32
• Average number NL/SOs affiliated with responding colleges	--	--	9
• Average number NL/SO activities participated in by colleges	3.4	4.2	3.8
• More involvement in NL/SOs by colleges in 1990 than in 1980	57%	72%	65%
• Average number of AACJC councils with which colleges affiliated	5.8	6.9	6.4
• Colleges indicating overall value of NL/SOs as significant or very significant	80%	80%	80%
• Average NL/SO leadership positions held by respondents	2.6	3.5	3.0
• Number of respondents with no NL/SO leadership positions	11	2	13

States in which responding colleges are located: Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

NOV 30 1990